
Christian Order

Summary of Contents for October 1968

HUMANAE VITAE	<i>Pope Paul VI</i>
COMMUNIST DOCTRINE	<i>W. H. Henderson</i>
CHURCH, MAN AND SOCIETY	<i>The Editor</i>
RIGHT AND WRONG	<i>John Biggs-Davison, M.P.</i>
THE REASON WHY	<i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>
MONEY AND BANKING	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
THE CULT OF PERSONALITY	<i>E. L. Way</i>

Contents

Page

- 577 THE CULT OF PERSONALITY
E. L. Way
- 579 COMMUNIST DOCTRINE
W. H. Henderson
- 585 HUMANA VITAE
Paulus PP. VI
- 603 CHURCH, MAN AND SOCIETY
The Editor
- 615 RIGHT AND WRONG
John Biggs-Davison, M.P.
- 623 WHAT KIND OF ECONOMIC SYSTEM?
J. M. Jackson
- 631 ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson, S.J.
- 635 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by Lithographic Universal Ltd., Bray.

Annual subscription: one year, twenty shillings; in the U.S.A., Canada and Australia, three dollars; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 20/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 9

OCTOBER, 1968

NUMBER 10

The Cult of Personality

E. L. WAY

THE cult of personality as a purely political phenomenon, the building up of the one-man party in a one-party State, may be restricted to the dictatorships of our time. This *fuehrerprinzip* is widely understood and as widely feared and hated. But the cult of personality in the sense of building up public figures into great men whose every word on any subject is held to be of importance is something that has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.

When John Osborne was recently interviewed by Kenneth Tynan for *The Observer* he was asked if it was not somewhat limiting to concentrate on show business people, as he has done in his two most recent plays, and he answered, "Not at all, because nowadays almost everyone is tainted with show business. Dockers are interviewed in the streets . . . We're all in show-biz now. It isn't a closed metaphor any more". Some of our clerical spokesmen, makers of instant theology, could be easily categorized if it was more fully appreciated that they are in show-biz. They may not have intended this. In the beginning they may have been stating their views for the clarification of truth, but the mass media have added their scalps to the many which are already dangling from the impresarios' belts. They are victims, delighted victims, of the degraded cult of personality. For nowadays anyone who has distinguished or disgraced himself, say with a four-year prison sentence, is dolled up with grease

paint and thrust before a television camera, or given five columns in one of our classy Sunday papers. It is all great fun: the audience is amused or shocked, the fees are paid, the damage is done, and the irresponsible perpetrators wheel on the next victim.

This canonisation of the ego, or personality, will continue to erode our rapidly diminishing standards of judgment and behaviour. An objector could fairly retort that he preferred the canonisation of the ego of one man to the canonisation of the collective ego of an established body of faceless people who know little except how to wield power, either for its own sake or in the interests of some body of inhuman doctrine or principle. Between the two extremes lies our salvation. We don't have to kneel down and knock our foreheads on the ground to authority, but neither do we have to take our orders or our thinking from show-biz 'personalities'.

Tension will exist: it is important that it should. A Catholic priest wrote to Bernard Shaw: "In your play (Saint Joan), "I see the dramatic presentation of the conflict of the Regal, sacerdotal, and Prophetical powers, in which Joan was crushed. To me it is not the victory of any one of them over the others that will bring peace and the reign of the saints in the Kingdom of God, but their fruitful interaction in a costly but noble state of tension". But we shall not have 'fruitful interaction in a costly but noble state of tension' in the public debate of questions of vital importance while the protagonists are selected on the tainted principles of show business.

One of the most important requirements for successfully combating Communism is an understanding of its theoretical teaching. Indeed, one critic of the system went so far as to say, "We will not attack the Communists. We will simply explain them." He meant that when people understood their philosophy, aims and objects, that in itself would be sufficient to discredit them. In this article Horace Henderson analyses the Theory of Increasing Misery, one of the keystones of Marxist-Leninist teaching. It is a simple, direct theory, easy to grasp, but its implications are horrifying.

Communist Doctrine

The Theory of Increasing Misery

W. H. HENDERSON

HAVE you ever heard of the "theory of increasing misery"? Every opponent of Communism should understand it, for it is the key to much else, and it is faithfully acted on by every indoctrinated Communist.

The theory of increasing misery was taught by Karl Marx in trying to predict the manner in which the capitalist system would collapse and give place to Socialism. According to Marx, the development of capitalism would lead to a situation in which the means of life would be more and more concentrated in the large employers' hands. At one end of the social scale there would be a large accumulation of wealth, and at the other end a propertyless 'proletariat', growing ever more desperate and hungry. Eventually, the

system would collapse and the proletariat would rise against the capitalists and dispossess them. (1)

A temporary proletarian dictatorship would be set up until such time as the old 'exploiting' class had been absorbed into the general body of society.

Promise of Paradise on Earth

The end results of this development would be a system of social justice, (the 'classless society') in which all would work in harmony for the common good, the underlying principles being "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need". Sin, poverty, war, exploitation, envy, hatred, and all the evils that have beset mankind from the beginning of recorded time would be abolished. And all this would result from the abolition of capitalism, the root of all evil.

It is safe to say that a more fantastic theory has never been propounded. The suggestion that all the evils that have baffled the greatest religious teachers and philosophers throughout the ages would disappear through the establishment of a new economic system would be laughable if the matter was not so serious. The most elementary understanding of psychology would have shown that a change in the economic system from private ownership to social ownership of the means of production could not possibly accomplish the miraculous change in man's nature that the establishment of this utopian paradise would require.

All experience has shown since Marx's time that, so far from moving towards this state of affairs, the world has moved steadily away from it wherever the followers of Marx have established themselves in power. The example of what has taken place in Russia and other Communist countries is the greatest refutation of Marxian illusions. Such experi-

1. "Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital,—grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this, too, grows the revolt of the working class.—The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with it, and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1. Chap. 32.

ments have not produced even the beginnings of a system of social justice. On the contrary, they have moved still further from it than the systems they have displaced. Yet the theory of increasing misery continues to influence the indoctrinated Marxist, and it explains many of his actions. Let us see why this is so.

The Communist Aim

The aim of the Communist is social revolution. But, according to his teachers, the revolution will come about only when the people are driven to revolt. They will not revolt if they are happy, secure and reasonably comfortable. It is through poverty, mass unemployment and desperation that revolt will come, the revolt that will lead to the social paradise on earth. (2)

It follows from this that creating industrial chaos is the way to revolution and social plenty. This will bring nearer the time when 'exploitation' will be abolished, and therefore it is, from the Communist viewpoint, a meritorious act. Conversely, the more prosperous men become, the more firmly the 'exploiting' capitalist system will be based, through the apathy towards revolution such desirable conditions will induce.

Sabotage

Such is the Communist viewpoint, and it helps us to understand the Communists' deliberate attempt to foment trouble in the industrial field. Those who imagine that Communists have no desire to go beyond obtaining better conditions for their fellow-workers have a very inadequate understanding of Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

If any further evidence was required of the Communists' intention to foment unemployment and social misery as a deliberate policy, it will be found in Douglas Hyde's book *I Believe*, where this former news editor of the *Daily Worker*, (now a brilliant critic of Communism) explains the reason for

2. The fact that a prosperous and contented proletariat is not disposed to revolutionary violence was recognised by Marx and Lenin. In his essay 'The Teachings of Karl Marx', (Little Lenin Library, Vol. 1) Lenin quotes with approval Marx's statement that 'prolonged prosperity demoralises the workers—their revolutionary energy oozes away'.

Communist opposition to the Marshall Plan. In the post-war years, the condition of Western Europe was near to desperate. The devastation of the war, the squandering of national wealth, and the interruption of normal trade relations had shattered the economies of wealthy and prosperous European countries. It was then that the United States stepped in with the Marshall Plan, one of the most generous offers ever made by any nation, the offer to pour out its treasures in restoring the war-torn economies of Europe. This offer was not confined to the capitalist countries. It was open to the Communist states as well. (3)

One would have thought that had the Communist countries, led by Russia, been anxious to improve the living conditions of the working class, (as they profess to be) they would have been grateful to the Americans for offering this help. But so far from this being the case, the Communists began a campaign to sabotage the Marshall Plan, and Russia even refused her satellites permission to participate. Why? Because this was not the road to social revolution in accordance with the theory of increasing misery, but a road away from it. It would improve the living standards of the people and make them less revolutionary. And so the Communists in Britain and elsewhere set out to wreck the Marshall Plan. (4).

Attack on British Trade Unions

Communists are not working for better conditions for the

3. Both Herbert Morrison, (Manchester, April 17th, 1948) and Aneurin Bevan, (Scarborough, May 18th, 1948) acknowledged that without Marshall Aid we would have had up to 2,000,000 unemployed in this country.

4. Douglas Hyde has explained the deliberate policy of the Communists acting on Soviet orders, to depress the living standards of the West for the benefit of the Communist East, which would then be relatively stronger. He says, "I was appalled at the thought that all over Europe, this side of the Iron Curtain, my party comrades would be working consciously and deliberately to produce economic crises, unemployment, social misery, malnutrition." He also states that he was asked by a prominent British Communist if he thought there was any truth in the suggestion that if we refused Marshall Aid, as the Communists demanded, we would have 3,000,000 unemployed in this country. The Communist said he believed this to be true and added, "We would be a bloody sight nearer Communism if we had 3,000,000 unemployed right now." The plan, as outlined by a leading British Communist, was simple. "In the docks and engineering industry we would work for national stoppages. If we could do the same on the railways we would do so. All our forces in London's dockland would concentrate their activities on the riverside workers. Our campaigns would be carefully planned." Douglas Hyde, *I Believe*, p. 262.

common people, but for the wrecking of British industry. This is no fantasy; it is a fact proved not only by the logic of their own theoretical teaching, but by statements they have made, and the evidence of their own actions. Where the Communists have the advantage over their own more honest fellow workers in industry is, of course, that they can always offer more than anyone else. This is attractive to those who do not understand that it is possible to wreck an industrial enterprise by placing burdens on it, in the name of social justice, that make it impossible to compete successfully in the markets of the world. We are an island people. We live by trade. We cannot feed ourselves, and have no other choice. If our trade position prospers, we have high employment and a decent living standard. If we fail, there is massive unemployment and social misery.

The sincere trade unionist is jealous of the workers' hard-won rights. He is vigilant in defending them. But he does not set out to ruin, by unofficial strikes and other means, the industry on which his own security is based. He will seek an increasing standard for his fellow-workers and himself when this is possible, but he will use his reason in determining what this should be.

Not so the Communist. His object is to foment strife in industry and if no trouble exists in a workshop, he will create it. He will outbid all others in his demands, and get the reputation of being a true and conscientious champion of the workers' rights. But his primary purpose will be service to the cause of Communist revolution, whatever the means required for its accomplishment. (5)

If the Communists Win

And what would happen if the Communists ever came to power in Britain? The working class would find themselves deprived of every right the free trade union movement has won in long years of industrial struggle. As in Russia and

5. The words of the T.U.C. General Council, published in their widely circulated pamphlet, 'Defend Democracy', 1948, are as valid today as when they first appeared: "Communist influences are everywhere at work to frame industrial demands for purposes of political agitation, to magnify grievances, and to bring about stoppages in industry."

the Communist satellite states, the trade unions would become merely organs of the government, that is, of the ruling Communist Party. They would not be allowed to strike, however just their cause, and their working conditions would be determined by the Communists alone. They would be deprived of every democratic liberty they now enjoy.

This is no myth. Leading trade union bodies in the free world, such as the American Federation of Labour, Congress of Industrial Organisations, and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, have repeatedly warned their members that trade unions in the Communist world are merely what the Americans call 'company unions', organisations run not for the benefit of the workers, but for the convenience of the employers, (in this case the Communist bosses). And it would happen here as surely as it has happened behind the Iron Curtain.

That is why it is so essential for those who wish to preserve trade unionism as we know it in the free world and to ensure a reasonable standard of living for the working masses, to grasp the meaning of Communist action in industry. It is action which is not directed primarily to serving the interests of the people, but to the achievement of that social revolution which, the Communists believe, will follow implementation of the theory of increasing misery.

The goal the Communists profess to seek can never be realised by the methods they employ. But how much suffering they will inflict on the world unless their aims are clearly understood, and the falsity of their revolutionary creed continually exposed.

VOICE OF THE CHURCH

Humanae Vitae

VENERABLE BROTHERS AND BELOVED SONS,

The Transmission of Life

1. The most serious duty of transmitting human life, for which married persons are the free and responsible collaborators of God the Creator, has always been a source of great joys to them, even if sometimes accompanied by not a few difficulties and by distress.

At all times the fulfilment of this duty has posed grave problems to the conscience of married persons, but, with the recent evolution of society, changes have taken place that give rise to new questions which the Church could not ignore, having to do with a matter which so closely touches upon the life and happiness of men.

New Formulation of the Problem

2. The changes which have taken place are in fact noteworthy and of varied kinds. In the first place, there is the rapid demographic development. Fear is shown by many that world population is growing more rapidly than the available resources, with growing distress to many families and developing countries, so that the temptation for Authorities to counter this danger with radical measures is great. Moreover, working and lodging conditions, as well as increased exigencies both in the economic field and in that of education, often make the proper education of an elevated number of children difficult today. A change is also seen both in the manner of considering the person of women and her place in society, and in the value to be attributed to conjugal love in marriage, and also in the appreciation to be made of the meaning of conjugal acts in relation to that love.

Finally and above all, man has made stupendous progress in the domination and rational organisation of the forces of nature, such that he tends to extend this domination to his own total being : to the body, to physical life, to social life,

and even to the laws which regulate the transmission of life.

3. This new state of things gives rise to new questions. Granted the conditions of life today, and granted the meaning which conjugal relations have with respect to the harmony between husband and wife and to their mutual fidelity, would not a revision of the ethical norms in force up to now, seem to be advisable, especially when it is considered that they cannot be observed without sacrifices, sometimes heroic sacrifices?

And again: by extending to this field the application of the so-called "principle of totality", could it not be admitted that the intention of a less abundant but more rationalised fecundity might transform a materially sterilising intervention into a licit and wise control of birth? Could it not be admitted, that is, that the finality of procreation pertains to the ensemble of conjugal life, rather than to its single acts? It is also asked whether, in view of the increased sense of responsibility of modern man, the moment has not come for him to entrust to his reason and his will, rather than to the biological rhythms of his organism, the task of regulating birth.

Competency of the Magisterium

4. Such questions required from the teaching authority of the Church a new and deeper reflection upon the principles of the moral teaching on marriage: a teaching founded on the natural law, illuminated and enriched by divine Revelation.

No believer will wish to deny that the teaching authority of the Church is competent to interpret even the natural moral law. It is, in fact, indisputable, as Our Predecessors have many times declared, that Jesus Christ, when communicating to Peter and to the Apostles His divine authority and sending them to teach all nations His commandments, constituted them as guardians and authentic interpreters of all the moral law, not only, that is, of the law of the Gospel, but also of the natural law, which is also an expression of the will of God, the faithful fulfilment of which is equally necessary for salvation.

Conformably to this mission of hers, the Church has always provided — and even more amply in recent times — a coherent teaching concerning both the nature of marriage and the correct use of conjugal rights and the duties of husband and wife.

Special Studies

5. The consciousness of that same mission induced Us to confirm and enlarge the Study Commission which Our Predecessor Pope John XXIII of happy memory had instituted in March 1963. That Commission which included, besides several experts in the various pertinent disciplines, also married couples, had as its scope the gathering of opinions on the new questions regarding conjugal life, and in particular on the regulation of births, and of furnishing opportune elements of information so that the Magisterium could give an adequate reply to the expectation not only of the faithful, but also of world opinion.

The work of these experts, as well as the successive judgments and counsels spontaneously forwarded by or expressly requested from a good number of Our Brothers in the Episcopate, have permitted Us to measure more exactly all the aspects of this complex matter. Hence with all Our heart We express to each of them Our lively gratitude.

Reply of the Magisterium

6. The conclusions at which the Commission arrived could not, nevertheless, be considered by Us as definite, nor dispense Us from a personal examination of this serious question; and this also because within the Commission itself, no full concordance of judgments concerning the moral norms to be proposed had been reached, and above all because certain criteria of solutions had emerged which departed from the moral teaching on marriage proposed with constant firmness by the teaching authority of the Church.

Therefore, having attentively sifted the documentation laid before Us, after mature reflexion and assiduous prayers, We now intend, by virtue of the mandate entrusted to Us by Christ, to give Our reply to these grave questions.

A Total Vision of Man

7. The problem of birth, like every other problem regarding human life, is to be considered, beyond partial perspective — whether of the biological or psychological, demographic or sociological orders — in the light of an integral vision of man and of his vocation, not only his natural and earthly, but also his supernatural and eternal vocation. And since, in the attempt to justify artificial methods of birth control, many have appealed to the demands both of conjugal love and of “responsible parenthood”, it is good to state very precisely the true concept of these two great realities of married life, referring principally to what was recently set forth in this regard, and in a highly authoritative form, by the Second Vatican Council in its Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*.

Conjugal Love

8. Conjugal love reveals its true nature and nobility when it is considered in its supreme origin, God, Who is Love, “the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named”.

Marriage is not, then, the effect of chance or the product of evolution of unconscious natural forces; it is the wise institution of the Creator to realise in mankind His design of love. By means of the reciprocal personal gift of self, proper and exclusive to them, husband and wife tend towards the communion of their beings in view of mutual personal perfection, to collaborate with God in the generation and education of new lives.

For baptised persons, moreover, marriage invests the dignity of a sacramental sign of grace, inasmuch as it represents the union of Christ and of the Church.

Its characteristics

9. Under this light, there clearly appear the characteristic marks and demands of conjugal love, and it is of supreme importance to have an exact idea of these.

This love is first of all fully *human*, that is to say, of the senses and of the spirit at the same time. It is not, then, a

simple transport of instinct and sentiment, but also, and principally, an act of the free will, intended to endure and to grow by means of the joys and sorrows of daily life, in such a way that husband and wife become one only heart and one only soul, and together attain their human perfection.

Then, this love is *total*, that is to say, it is a very special form of personal friendship, in which husband and wife generously share everything, without undue reservations or selfish calculations. Whoever truly loves his marriage partner loves not only for what he receives, but for the partner's self, rejoicing that he can enrich his partner with the gift of himself.

Again, this love is *faithful* and *exclusive* until death. Thus in fact do bride and groom conceive it to be on the day when they freely and in full awareness assume the duty of the marriage bond. A fidelity, this, which can sometimes be difficult, but is always possible, always noble and meritorious, as no one can deny. The example of so many married persons down through the centuries shows, not only that fidelity is according to the nature of marriage, but also that it is a source of profound and lasting happiness.

And finally, this love is *fecund*, for it is not exhausted by the communion between husband and wife, but is destined to continue, raising up new lives. "Marriage and conjugal love are by their nature ordained towards the begetting and educating of children. Children are really the supreme gift of marriage and contribute very substantially to the welfare of their parents."

Responsible Parenthood

10. Hence conjugal love requires in husband and wife an awareness of their mission of "responsible parenthood", which today is rightly much insisted upon, and which also must be exactly understood. Consequently it is to be considered under different aspects which are legitimate and connected with one another.

In relation to the biological processes, responsible parenthood means the knowledge and respect of their functions;

human intellect discovers in the power of giving life biological laws which are part of the human person.

In relation to the tenderness of instinct or passion, responsible parenthood means that necessary dominion which reason and will must exercise over them.

In relation to physical, economic, psychological and social conditions, responsible parenthood is exercised, either by the deliberate and generous decision to raise a numerous family, or by the decision, made for grave motives and with due respect for the moral law, to avoid for the time being, or even for an indefinite period, a new birth.

Responsible parenthood also and above all implies a more profound relationship to the objective moral order established by God, of which a right conscience is the faithful interpreter. The responsible exercise of parenthood implies, therefore, that husband and wife recognise fully their own duties towards God, towards themselves, towards the family and towards society, in a correct hierarchy of values.

In the task of transmitting life, therefore, they are not free to proceed completely at will, as if they could determine in a wholly autonomous way the honest path to follow; but they must conform their activity to the creative intention of God expressed in the very nature of marriage and of its acts, and manifested by the constant teachings of the Church.

Respect for the Nature and Purposes of the Marriage Act

11. These acts, by which husband and wife are united in chaste intimacy, and by means of which human life is transmitted, are, as the Council recalled, "noble and worthy" and they do not cease to be lawful if, for causes independent of the will of husband and wife, they are foreseen to be infecund, since they always remain ordained towards expressing and consolidating their union. In fact, as experience bears witness, not every conjugal act is followed by a new life. God has wisely disposed natural laws and rhythms of fecundity which, of themselves, cause a separation in the succession of births. Nonetheless the Church, calling men back to the observance of the norms of the natural law, as interpreted by her constant doctrine, teaches that each and

every marriage act (*quilibet matrimonii usus*) must remain open to the transmission of life.

Two inseparable aspects: Union and procreation

12. That teaching, often set forth by the Magisterium, is founded upon the inseparable connection, willed by God and unable to be broken by man on his own initiative, between the two meanings of the conjugal act: the unitive meaning and the procreative meaning. Indeed, by its intimate structure, the conjugal act, while most closely uniting husband and wife, capacitates them from the generation of new lives, according to laws inscribed in the very being of man and of woman. By safeguarding both these essential aspects, the unitive and the procreative, the conjugal act preserves in its fullness the sense of true mutual love and its ordination towards man's most high calling to parenthood. We believe that the men of our day are particularly capable of seizing the deeply reasonable and human character of this fundamental principle.

Faithfulness to God's design

13. It is in fact justly observed that a conjugal act imposed upon one's partner without regard for his or her condition and lawful desires is not a true act of love, and therefore denies an exigency of right moral order in the relationship between husband and wife. Hence, one who reflects well must also recognise that a reciprocal act of love, which jeopardises the disponibility to transmit life which God the Creator, according to particular laws, inserted herein, is in contradiction with the design constitutive of marriage, and with the will of the Author of life. To use this divine gift destroying, even if only partially, its meaning and its purpose is to contradict the nature both of man and of woman and of their most intimate relationship, and therefore it is to contradict also the plan of God and His will. On the other hand, to make use of the gift of conjugal love while respecting the laws of the generative process means to acknowledge oneself not to be the arbiter of the sources of human life, but rather the minister of the design established

by the Creator. In fact, just as man does not have unlimited dominion over his body in general, so also, with particular reason, he has no such dominion over his generative faculties as such, because of their intrinsic ordination towards raising up life, of which God is the principle. "Human life is sacred", Pope John XXIII recalled; "from its very inception it reveals the creating hand of God".

Illicit ways of Regulating Birth

14. In conformity with these landmarks in the human and Christian vision of marriage, We must once again declare that the direct interruption of the generative process already begun, and, above all, directly willed and procured abortion, even if for therapeutic reasons, are to be absolutely excluded as licit means of regulating birth.

Equally to be excluded, as the teaching authority of the Church has frequently declared, is direct sterilisation, whether perpetual or temporary, whether of the man or of the woman. Similarly excluded is every action which, either in anticipation of the conjugal act, or in its accomplishment, or in the development of its natural consequences, proposes, whether as an end or as a means, to render procreation impossible.

To justify conjugal acts made intentionally infecund, one cannot invoke as valid reasons the lesser evil, or the fact that such acts would constitute a whole together with the fecund acts already performed or to follow later, and hence would share in one and the same moral goodness. In truth, if it is sometimes licit to tolerate a lesser evil in order to avoid a greater evil or to promote a greater good, it is not licit, even for the gravest reasons, to do evil so that good may follow therefrom; that is, to make into the object of a positive act of the will something which is intrinsically disorderly, and hence unworthy of the human person, even when the intention is to safeguard or promote individual, family or social well-being. Consequently it is an error to think that a conjugal act which is deliberately made infecund and so is intrinsically dishonest could be made honest and right by the ensemble of a fecund conjugal life.

Licitness of Therapeutic Means

15. The Church, on the contrary, does not at all consider illicit the use of those therapeutic means truly necessary to cure diseases of the organism, even if an impediment to procreation, which may be foreseen, should result therefrom, provided such impediment is not, for whatever motive, directly willed.

Licitness of recourse to infecund periods

16. To this teaching of the Church on conjugal morals, the objection is made today, as We observed earlier (No. 3), that it is the prerogative of the human intellect to dominate the energies offered by irrational nature and to orientate them towards an end conformable to the good of man. Now, some may ask: In the present case, is it not reasonable in many circumstances to have recourse to artificial birth control if, hereby, we secure the harmony and peace of the family, and better conditions for the education of the children already born? To this question it is necessary to reply with clarity: The Church is the first to praise and recommend the intervention of intelligence in a function which so closely associates the rational creature with his Creator; but she affirms that this must be done with respect for the order established by God.

If, then, there are serious motives to space out births, which derive from the physical or psychological conditions of husband and wife, or from external conditions, the Church teaches that it is then licit to take into account the natural rhythms immanent in the generative functions, for the use of marriage in the infecund periods only, and in this way to regulate birth without offending the moral principles which have been recalled earlier.

The Church is coherent with herself when she considers recourse to the infecund periods to be licit, while at the same time condemning, as being always illicit, the use of means directly contrary to fecundation, even if such use is inspired by reasons which may appear honest and serious. In reality, there are essential differences between the two cases: in the former, the married couple make legitimate use of a natural

disposition; in the latter, they impede the development of natural processes. It is true that, in the one and the other case, the married couple are concordant in the positive will of avoiding children for plausible reasons, seeking the certainty that offspring will not arrive; but it is also true that only in the former case are they able to renounce the use of marriage in the fecund periods, when, for just motives, procreation is not desirable, while making use of it during infecund periods to manifest their affection and to safeguard their mutual fidelity. By so doing, they give proof of a truly and integrally honest love.

Grave Consequences of methods of Artificial Birth Control

17. Upright men can even better convince themselves of the solid grounds on which the teaching of the Church in this field is based, if they care to reflect upon the consequences of methods of artificial birth control. Let them consider, first of all, how wide and easy a road would thus be opened up towards conjugal infidelity and the general lowering of morality. Not much experience is needed in order to know human weakness, and to understand that men—especially the young, who are so vulnerable on this point—have need of encouragement to be faithful to the moral law, so that they must not be offered some easy means of eluding its observance. It is also to be feared that the man, growing used to the employment of anti-conceptive practices may finally lose respect for the woman and, no longer caring for her physical and psychological equilibrium, may come to the point of considering her as a mere instrument of selfish enjoyment, and no longer as his respected and beloved companion.

Let it be considered also that a dangerous weapon would thus be placed in the hands of those public Authorities who take no heed of moral exigencies. Who could blame a Government for applying to the solution of the problems of the community those means acknowledged to be licit for married couples in the solution of a family problem? Who will stop rulers from favouring, from even imposing upon their people, if they were to consider it necessary, the method of contraception which they judge to be most efficacious?

In such a way men, wishing to avoid individual, family, or social difficulties encountered in the observance of the divine law, would reach the point of placing at the mercy of the intervention of public Authorities the most personal and most reserved sector of conjugal intimacy.

Consequently, if the mission of generating life is not to be exposed to the arbitrary will of men, one must necessarily recognise insurmountable limits to the possibility of man's domination over his own body and its functions; limits which no man, whether a private individual or one vested with authority, may licitly suppress. And such limits cannot be determined otherwise than by the respect due to the integrity of the human organism and its functions, according to the principles recalled earlier, and also according to the correct understanding of the "principle of totality" illustrated by Our Predecessor Pope Pius XII.

The Church guarantor of True Human Values

18. It can be foreseen that this teaching will perhaps not be easily received by all: too numerous are those voices — amplified by the modern means of propaganda — which are contrary to the voice of the Church. To tell the truth, the Church is not surprised to be made, like her divine Founder, "sign of contradiction", yet she does not because of this cease to proclaim with humble firmness the entire moral law, both natural and evangelical. Of such laws the Church was not the author, nor consequently can she be their arbiter; she is only their depositary and their interpreter, without ever being able to declare to be licit that which is not so by reason of its intimate and unchangeable opposition to the true good of man.

In defending conjugal morals in their integral wholeness, the Church knows that she contributes towards the establishment of a truly human civilisation; she engages man not to abdicate from his own responsibility in order to rely on technical means; by that very fact she defends the dignity of man and wife. Faithful to both the teaching and the example of the Saviour, she shows herself to be the sincere and disinterested friend of men, whom she wishes to help, even

during their earthly sojourn, "to share as sons in the life of the living God, the Father of all men".

The Church Mater et Magistra

19. Our words would not be an adequate expression of the thought and solicitude of the Church, Mother and Teacher of all peoples, if, after having recalled men to the observance and respect of the divine law regarding matrimony, We did not strengthen them in the path of honest regulation of birth, even amid the difficult conditions which today afflict families and peoples. The Church, in fact, cannot have a different conduct towards men than that of the Redeemer: she knows their weaknesses, has compassion on the crowd, receives sinners; but she cannot renounce the teaching of the law which is, in reality, that law proper to a human life restored to its original truth and conducted by the Spirit of God. Though We are thinking also of all men of good will. We now address Ourselves particularly to Our sons, from whom We expect a prompter and more generous adherence.

Possibility of observing the Divine Law

20. The teaching of the Church on the regulation of birth, which promulgates the divine law, will easily appear to many to be difficult or even impossible of actuation. And indeed, like all great beneficent realities, it demands serious engagement and much effort, individual, family and social effort. More than that, it would not be practicable without the help of God, Who upholds and strengthens the good will of men. Yet, to anyone who reflects well, it cannot but be clear that such efforts ennoble man and are beneficial to the human community.

Mastery of self

21. The honest practice of regulation of birth demands first of all that husband and wife acquire and possess solid convictions concerning the true values of life and of the family, and that they tend towards securing perfect self-mastery. To dominate instinct by means of one's reason and free will undoubtedly requires ascetical practices, so that

he affective manifestations of conjugal life may observe the correct order, in particular with regard to the observance of periodic continence. Yet this discipline which is proper to the purity of married couples, far from harming conjugal love, rather confers on it a higher human value. It demands continual effort yet, thanks to its beneficent influence, husband and wife fully develop their personalities, being enriched with spiritual values. Such discipline bestows upon family life fruits of serenity and peace, and facilitates the solution of other problems; it favours attention for one's partner, helps both parties to drive out selfishness, the enemy of true love; and deepens their sense of responsibility. By its means, parents acquire the capacity of having a deeper and more efficacious influence in the education of their offspring; little children and youths grow up with a just appraisal of human values, and in the serene and harmonious development of their spiritual and sensitive faculties.

Creating an atmosphere favourable to Chastity

22. On this occasion, We wish to draw the attention of educators, and of all who perform duties of responsibility in regard to the common good of human society, to the need of creating an atmosphere favourable to education in chastity, that is, to the triumph of healthy liberty over licence by means of respect for the moral order.

Everything in the modern media of social communications which leads to sense excitation and unbridled customs, as well as every form of pornography and licentious performances, must arouse the frank and unanimous reaction of all those who are solicitous for the progress of civilisation and the defence of the supreme good of the human spirit. Vainly could one seek to justify such depravation with the pretext of artistic or scientific exigencies, or to deduce an argument from the freedom allowed in this sector by the public authorities.

Appeal to public Authorities

23. To rulers, who are those principally responsible for the common good, and who can do so much to safeguard

moral customs, We say : Do not allow the morality of your peoples to be degraded; do not permit that by legal means practices contrary to the natural and divine law be introduced into the fundamental cell, the family. Quite other is the way in which public Authorities can and must contribute to the solution of the demographic problem : namely, the way of a provident policy for the family, of a wise education of peoples in respect of the moral law and the liberty of citizens.

We are well aware of the serious difficulties experienced by public Authorities in this regard, especially in the developing countries. To their legitimate preoccupations We devoted Our Encyclical Letter *Populorum Progressio*. But, with Our Predecessor Pope John XXIII, We repeat : No solution to these difficulties is acceptable "which does violence to man's essential dignity" and is based only "on an utterly materialistic conception of man himself and of his life." The only possible solution to this question is one which envisages the social and economic progress both of individuals and of the whole of human society, and which respects and promotes true human values. Neither can one, without grave injustice, consider divine Providence to be responsible for what depends, instead, on a lack of wisdom in government or an insufficient sense of social justice, on selfish monopolisation or again on blameworthy indolence in confronting the effort and the sacrifices necessary to ensure the raising of living standards of a people and of all its sons.

May all responsible public Authorities — as some are already doing so laudably — generously revive their efforts. And may mutual aid between all the members of the great human family never cease to grow : this is an almost limitless field which thus opens up to the activity of the great international organisations.

To Men of Science

24. We wish now to express Our encouragement to men of science, who "can considerably advance the welfare of marriage and the family, along with peace of conscience, if by pooling their efforts they labour to explain more thoroughly the various conditions favouring a proper regulation of

births". It is particularly desirable that, according to the wish already expressed by Pope Pius XII, medical science succeed in providing a sufficiently secure basis for a regulation of birth, founded on the observance of natural rhythms. In this way, scientists and especially Catholic scientists will contribute to demonstrate in actual fact that, as the Church teaches, "a true contradiction cannot exist between the divine laws pertaining to the transmission of life and those pertaining to the fostering of authentic conjugal love".

To Christian husbands and wives

25. And now Our words more directly address Our own children, particularly those whom God calls to serve Him in marriage. The Church, while teaching imprescriptible demands of the divine law, announces the tidings of salvation, and by means of the Sacraments opens up the paths of grace, which makes man a new creature, capable of corresponding with love and true freedom to the design of his Creator and Saviour, and of finding the yoke of Christ to be sweet.

Christian married couples, then, docile to her voice, must remember that their Christian vocation, which began at baptism, is further specified and reinforced by the Sacrament of Matrimony. By it husband and wife are strengthened and as it were consecrated for the faithful accomplishment of their proper duties, for the carrying out of their proper vocation even to perfection, and the Christian witness which is proper to them before the whole world. To them the Lord entrusts the task of making visible to men the holiness and sweetness of the law which unites the mutual love of husband and wife with their co-operation with the love of God the Author of human life.

We do not at all intend to hide the sometimes serious difficulties inherent in the life of Christian married persons; for them as for everyone else, "the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life". But the hope of that life must illuminate their way as with courage they strive to live with wisdom, justice and piety in this present time, knowing that the figure of this world passes away.

Let married couples, then, face up to the efforts needed, supported by the faith and hope which "do not disappoint . . . because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit, Who has been given to us"; let them implore divine assistance by persevering prayer; above all, let them draw from the source of grace and charity in the Eucharist. And if sin should still keep its hold over them, let them not be discouraged, but rather have recourse with humble perseverance to the mercy of God, which is poured forth in the Sacrament of Penance. In this way they will be enabled to achieve the fulness of conjugal life described by the Apostle: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the Church . . . Husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. For no man ever hates his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, as Christ does the Church. This is a great mystery, and I mean in reference to Christ and the Church. However, let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband."

Apostolate in homes

26. Among the fruits which ripen forth from a generous effort of fidelity to the divine law, one of the most precious is that married couples themselves not infrequently feel the desire to communicate their experience to others. Thus there comes to be included in the vast pattern of the vocation of the laity a new and most noteworthy form of the apostolate of like to like: it is married couples themselves who become apostles and guides to other married couples. This is assuredly, among so many forms of apostolate, one of those which seem most opportune today.

To Doctors and medical personnel

27. We hold those physicians and medical personnel in the highest esteem who, in the exercise of their profession, value above every human interest the superior demands of their Christian vocation. Let them persevere, therefore, in promoting on every occasion the discovery of solutions inspired by faith and right reason, let them strive to arouse

his conviction and this respect in their associates. Let them also consider as their proper professional duty the task of acquiring all the knowledge needed in this delicate sector, so as to be able to give to those married persons who consult them wise counsel and healthy direction, such as they have a right to expect.

To Priests

28. Beloved priest sons, by vocation you are the counsellors and spiritual guides of individual persons and of families. We now turn to you with confidence. Your first task — especially in the case of those who teach moral theology — is to expound the Church's teaching on marriage without ambiguity. Be the first to give, in the exercise of your ministry, the example of loyal internal and external obedience to the teaching authority of the Church. That obedience, as you know well, obliges not only because of the reasons adduced, but rather because of the light of the Holy Spirit, which is given in a particular way to the Pastors of the Church in order that they may illustrate the truth. You know, too, that it is of the utmost importance, for peace of consciences and for the unity of the Christian people, that in the field of morals as well as in that of dogma, all should attend to the Magisterium of the Church, and all should speak the same language. Hence, with all Our heart We renew to you the heartfelt plea of the great Apostle Paul: 'I appeal to you, brethren, by the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree and that there be no dissensions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same judgment'.

29. To diminish in no way the saving teaching of Christ constitutes an eminent form of charity for souls. But this must ever be accompanied by patience and goodness, such as the Lord Himself gave example of in dealing with men. Having come not to condemn but to save, He was indeed intransigent with evil, but merciful towards individuals.

In their difficulties, may married couples always find, in the words and in the heart of a priest, the echo of the voice and the love of the Redeemer.

To Bishops

30. Beloved and Venerable Brothers in the Episcopate, with whom We most intimately share the solicitude of the spiritual good of the People of God, at the conclusion of this Encyclical Our reverent and affectionate thoughts turn to you. To all of you we extend an urgent invitation. At the head of the priests, your collaborators, and of your faithful, work ardently and incessantly for the safeguarding and the holiness of marriage, so that it may always be lived in its entire human and Christian fullness. Consider this mission as one of your most urgent responsibilities at the present time. As you know, it implies concerted pastoral action in all the fields of human activity, economic, cultural and social; for, in fact, only a simultaneous improvement in these various sectors will make it possible to render the life of parents and of children within their families not only tolerable, but easier and more joyous, to render the living together in human society more fraternal and peaceful, in faithfulness to God's design for the world.

Final appeal

31. Venerable Brothers, most beloved sons, and all men of good will, great indeed is the work of education, of progress and of love to which We call you, upon the foundation of the Church's teaching, of which the Successor of Peter is together with His Brothers in the Episcopate, the depositary and interpreter. Truly a great work, as We are deeply convinced, both for the world and for the Church, since man cannot find true happiness — towards which he aspires with all his being — other than in respect of the laws written by God in his very nature, laws which he must observe with intelligence and love. Upon this work, and upon all of you, and especially upon married couples, We invoke the abundant graces of the God of holiness and mercy, and in pledge thereof We impart to you all Our Apostolic Blessing.

Given at Rome, from Saint Peter's, this twenty-first day of July, Feast of Saint James the Apostle, in the year nineteen hundred and sixty-eight, the sixth of our Pontificate.

• PAULUS PP. VI

CURRENT COMMENT

The possession of a soul gives man the dignity that is his as a responsible human being. As such each man has, irrespective of class, colour, or creed, the basic right to choose his way forward through life, and to take responsibility for the choices he makes. Governments are judged by the ways in which they encourage or discourage men from taking charge of their lives.

Church, Man and Society:

An Introduction

(1) The Political Angle

THE EDITOR

CHRISTIANS see their world against a background of God . That is why these notes have to start with the twin facts of God's existence and man's creation by God. These facts are taken for granted. Our concern here is not with their proof, but their implications for man and the life he is meant to lead on earth in the company of other men.

To create means to make out of nothing. This is not to say that, when God creates a man, he takes something called nothing out of which he makes him. What is meant, rather, is that, in the case of the direct creation of a human soul, God has need of no pre-existing something from man's part out of which to make it. No human being contributes anything to that which gives him life. The substance of his humanity is entirely from God. No part of it is owed in any way to himself. His dependence on his maker is thereby rendered complete. It is otherwise with human manufacture.

The craftsman needs the raw material of his craft. Without it his skill is incapable of concrete expression. No matter how brilliant his handiwork, some part of its making is necessarily due to the raw material out of which it is made. Man's relationship, even to his finest masterpiece, is one of interdependence. We can never be said to own it in the same way God owns those he has made out of nothing. His work can never depend on him in the same way that created human beings depend on God. Because of this dependence they belong to God absolutely and completely. Out of it comes their obligation to serve him. The manner of their service concerns us closely in what follows.

Man serves God through the fulfilment of himself as a human being. His task is to turn himself with the help of God's grace, into a true man; to become all that is meant by a fine person.

Man's Basic Right in Society

To the extent that he does so he becomes a credit to his Creator. Thereby, he gives glory to God. We are not concerned here with the consequences of man's failure or success in this regard. The important thing to notice is what service entails; to take stock of the requirements of human fulfilment. This can be done very easily once human fulfilment is thought of in terms of growth. Man is meant to grow into the fullness of his humanity; to shape his life each day more splendidly into the image of God. He can do this only through the exercise of his human powers. What counts in this regard is not the upthrust of physical life or the range of instinct. They are relevant, but subordinate to the interplay of understanding and will. These are the powers which man has as a human being. He can only grow as a human being through their exercise. They are the source of his dignity as a person. His personality can be developed only through their use. It follows that he must be allowed the opportunity of using them; that the circumstances of the society in which he lives must be such as to enable him to make his own way forward in freedom under God.

This is a large claim, but it is inescapable. Understanding

and will combine in every man to spell out as typical a course of action in which he chooses his way forward through life and takes responsibility for the choices he makes. This is so because choosing is freedom in action and freedom is a condition assigned to each one through his possession of understanding and will. Obligated as he is to employ both these powers in the process of self-fulfilment man can lay claim to a field of choice commensurate with their scope; one suited to his dignity as a human person. His basic right in society is that which entitles him to the opportunity of responsible action. Respect for this right is the condition of man's fulfilment as a person. Through it he serves God. The Catholic Church is the guardian of man's service of God. It follows that she must be closely concerned with his basic right. Her interest in political and social affairs proceeds from this point. It is not direct. Political and social arrangements concern her indirectly — to the extent that they constrict, enlarge or abolish man's field of responsible choice. This is what Christian apologists have in mind when they explain the Church's interest in temporal affairs as a consequence of her necessary concern with human dignity.

Basic Right belongs to all Men

It will be useful in a moment to study some examples of the kind of clash which arises from time to time between the Church and the temporal order. Before doing so, there is an aspect of man's basic right in society that should be stressed. It is that it belongs to all men whatever their colour, class, creed or race. What matters in its context is not whether they be rich or poor, sick or well, black, white, yellow or brown, Christian, Muslim, Pagan or Protestant. The only thing that matters is that within them which makes them the men they are. This is the soul which each one has, which makes him in the likeness of God and which gives him the dignity that is his as a responsible human being made in God's image. As such, every man has the right to choose his way forward through life and to take responsibility for the choices he makes. The full exercise of this right can be curtailed by competent authority for a variety of good

reasons. At the same time, it remains true that none can be denied its substance on the ground, for example, of colour, race or religion. What matters here is neither the colour of a man's skin nor his religion. They are no more relevant to the question than the size of his feet or the shape of his head. What counts is each man's soul. As the possessor of it, black can claim equally with white and Protestant with Catholic the right to take responsibility for his own life under God. In upholding this basic right on behalf of every man, the Church is claiming no more than that each should be allowed and encouraged to act in accordance with his human nature.

As guardian of man's basic right the Church must oppose those who would prevent men from taking responsibility for their own lives under God. The origins of her frequent differences with the civil power, of the age-old struggle between God and Caesar, lie here. Man has the right to live like a man, to lead his own life. The clash comes when governments and social systems deny or constrict this right wrongfully in the case of some or all of a nation's people. They seek so to tie men to themselves and make them do their will that they are quite unable to lead their own lives or can do so only with difficulty. At this point, there is bound to be a clash with the church for, at this point, man's opportunity of responsible action, the condition of his service of God, is interfered with: the Church, being concerned with this service, is bound to oppose such interference. When she does so, her enemies say she is interfering with politics or business as the case may be. In fact, it is the businessmen and politicians who are interfering with the Church, because they are interfering with man's service of God, which has always been her concern. Under such circumstances, her relationship to them is that of a man who throws up his hands to defend himself when attacked. To call him an aggressor for so doing only adds insult to injury.

Essence of Slavery

Examples of interference by government and class leaders with man's basic right, of their use of political and social power to deprive individuals of their opportunity of responsi-

ible action or constrict it beyond due bounds, are, unfortunately, only too easy to find. One thinks, for instance, of the slavery of times gone by. The slave of those days was owned by his master and used by him as men today might make use of an instrument or tool that belonged to them. He was completely dependent for his existence on his master's will. His right, as a human being, to make his own way forward under God was in no way recognised. He was not thought of as responsible for his own life. His livelihood was wholly in the gift of his master whose service was considered the sole reason for his own continued existence. The essence of slavery was that, under it, a man was owned by another to the point where he was completely deprived of responsibility for his own actions. These were thought of as belonging not to him, but to the master who owned him. The denial of human dignity implicit in the slave system leads logically to a constriction to zero of the slave's field of personal choice. It is no coincidence that, with the coming of Christianity, the slave system of ancient empires first began to wither and die.

The State becomes God

Modern totalitarianism is best thought of as a modern form of slavery. Under it, the citizen is not bought in the market place as a slave is bought by his master. Neither, during his life, is he deprived outwardly of responsibility for his actions or placed so obviously at the beck and call of another. Nevertheless, he is subjected from birth to the total control of a government, which claims the whole totality) of his being for itself and which denies, in consequence, his right to make his way forward except in accordance with its wishes. Because God is denied under totalitarianism, the State, not God, is made the central reference point of every citizen's life. He is conditioned from earliest years to think only of doing its will. The State becomes God. The thought of the individual human being free to map out his own life is quite foreign to totalitarian thinking. Modern totalitarianism, therefore, is exactly like the slavery of olden days in that, under it, the livelihood of

the citizen is thought of as being wholly in the gift of a master (the State) whose service is the sole reason for the citizen's own continued existence. The difference between the two is one of degree and not of kind. Under totalitarianism, the slave master is not a single individual, but an all-powerful, all-embracing State, having at its disposal the most modern means for the enforcement on the citizens of the full extent of its power. We often call a totalitarian country a slave State.

Tool-making Animal

It is easy to see why the modern totalitarian State enslaves its citizens. In the case, for example, of communist totalitarianism, the denial of God, which is central to its thinking, leads at once to a further denial of man's right to serve God through fulfilment of himself as a human being. Once God is denied, man's soul is denied and, with it, his dignity, which flows from the fact that, because of his soul, he is made in the image of God. So far, then, as the Communist State is concerned, man is no more than the tool-making animal that Marx defined him to be. As such, he is valued not for what he is in himself, but only for what he can do to serve communist masters. This is what Pope Pius XII had in mind when he said, speaking eighteen years ago over the radio to Austrian Catholics, "In God alone is man free. If he denies God, he delivers himself straightway into the hands of totalitarian regimes". The Church's opposition to Communism is best seen as an example of her age-old struggle with those whose denial of human dignity leads them to attempt the enslavement of their fellow men.

Weakening the Sense of Responsibility

In the case of governments (and peoples) which disregard God, as distinct from actively denying him, the trend towards totalitarianism is not so obvious. What emerges is a strong tendency on the part of government to pay more attention to the material welfare of the citizen than to his dignity as a human person. This means that a materialistically-minded government of this sort will tend, for example

to take charge of the material side of the citizen's life even to the point where his field of action and so his ability to make and manage his own life is narrowly constricted. Eventually, his sense of responsibility becomes seriously impaired. Very often, the type of government we have in mind is not malicious. It does not actively intend any direct assault on the individual as a person. It is sincere in its opposition to totalitarianism. Its trouble is a disregard of God leading to an overconcern with the citizen's material well-being, which is wrongly identified with the whole of his happiness. In its anxiety to secure this, government tends to do too much for him and to exercise undue control over his life. As a result, there is gradually removed from him, as an individual human being, that responsibility for his own affairs which belongs to each one by right. Responsibility for this state of affairs does not lie wholly with government. It is easy enough to see how the citizens of a country whose outlook is like that of their paternalistic rulers, could come to accept such a situation as normal and be only too willing to let slip into the hands of government the responsibility which God means each one to have for his own affairs. As more is done for the citizen, he becomes less inclined to do much for himself. As a result, still more is done for him. The end of this kind of road could be a totalitarian State without the ruthlessness that marks Communist Russia, but equally repugnant to the Christian mind.

Tocqueville's Description

More than a hundred years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville described this process in his essay on *Democracy in America*:

"I seek to trace the novel features under which despotism may appear in the world. The first thing that strikes the observation is an innumerable multitude of men all equal and alike, incessantly endeavouring to procure the petty and paltry pleasures with which they glut their lives. . . Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratifications, and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident and mild. It would be like the authority

of a parent if, like that authority, its object was to prepare men for manhood; but it seeks, on the contrary, to keep them in perpetual childhood; it is content that the people should rejoice, provided they think of nothing but rejoicing. For their happiness such a government willingly labours, but it chooses to be the sole agent and only arbiter of that happiness; it provides for their security, foresees and supplies their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry, regulates the descent of property, and subdivides their inheritance — what remains, but to spare them all the care of thinking and all the trouble of living ? ”

The situation which de Tocqueville describes could be brought about by the kind of well-meaning social materialism which, in Britain, since the war, has caused the Labour Party to give birth to the Welfare State and the Conservative Party to rear it. The question is not one of the desirability of material welfare. It concerns, rather, the means taken to secure it. These can never be such as to go contrary to the claims of man's dignity. His duty to manage his own life responsibly cannot be sacrificed to the process of material improvement. Social materialism, however, tends to see material welfare as the supreme purpose of man's existence. Implicit in this outlook is a forgetfulness of man's dignity which causes its protagonists to work for his material welfare at the price of his right to live responsibly. Christianity's devotion to man's dignity makes it work for man's material welfare, but never in such a way as to endanger this right. For the social materialist, material welfare comes first and dignity second. For the Christian, dignity comes first and material welfare second. This must be the case for, as we shall see, material welfare is meant to be a support for human dignity. It must never be turned into a substitute for it. That is why Pope Pius XI said, in *Quadragesimo Anno*, that no one could be, at one and the same time, a Catholic and a Socialist properly so called.

Subsidiary Function

Governments can harm men by exercising too much power

over them. To arrive at the principle that limits a government's power we have to go back to the fact that man is meant to serve God in accordance with his nature as a free and responsible human being. The citizens of a country, therefore, should be free to assume responsibility for the management of their own lives. The basic purpose of civil society — what we may call its ultimate common good — is that they should be helped the more easily to do so. The real purpose of government (the political authority set up over the civil society of a nation) is to promote the ultimate good. The duty of government, therefore, is not merely to allow, but to encourage its citizens — as individuals and in family and other groups — to assume responsibility for their own lives. To the extent that it does this, government is faithful to its purpose. To the extent that it fails to do this, it denies, as Leo XIII said in *Rerum Novarum*, the very reason for its existence.

Therefore, the basic principle every government must use to guide its actions is that its task, so far as the citizen is concerned, is a helping or *subsidiary* one — from the Latin “*subsidium*”, which means help. The principle to which it must keep is what Catholic sociologists call the principle of subsidiary function. It is derived from man's basic right in society, which is to make his own way forward in freedom under God. The principle is violated when a government oppresses its people, considering that they exist only for itself and making them do everything for itself as in Nazism and Communism; or when, by doing everything for its people, it makes them less and less inclined to help or do anything for themselves. A sick society, therefore, is one in which a collectivist government prevents people from acting responsibly to help themselves because it either oppresses them directly, as in the totalitarian States; or does everything for them, as in the social-materialist State. A healthy society is one in which people are encouraged to do as much as possible for themselves. The art of good government is delegation, distribution downwards of power and responsibility — with care, of course, that these are used as they should be.

Duties of Government Extensive

The last few words are important. Those who stress today the subsidiary function of government are sometimes accused of wanting to turn a nation's life into a free-for-all; of advocating unlimited private enterprise. This is not so. Government has its duty to do in the civic community and that duty is extensive. What government should not do, however, is to take into its own hands departments of a nation's life, which individuals and smaller associations could and should run, subject to its watching brief, if only it would encourage them to do so. If a child walks with difficulty, a mother does it no good by constantly carrying it. That way, it will end up by never walking at all. A good mother will make it her business to teach her child to use its legs. It is the same with a government and its people. It must teach its citizens to use their legs. And it can do this even though, as in many underdeveloped countries today, it has, at the same time, to do for them many of those things which people of a mature and older country would do for themselves. It does these things because its people are not yet ready to do for themselves certain things which have to be done at once. This is understandable. What such a government must do at the same time, however, is so to educate and encourage its people that they will soon be able to do these things for themselves. Government must not look forward to a future in which it has total charge of the lives of its people. It must encourage its people to take charge of their own lives. It can and should do this, even though forced by circumstances to do for them much that the people of an older nation would do for themselves. What counts here is the tendency of a government — its future course judged in the light of past performance — rather than the actual state of affairs prevailing at any particular moment of time.

A Thing is not Good because it is Freely Chosen

There is another point where people sometimes get confused. Much has been said already about people choosing their own way forward and taking responsibility for the

choices they make. But, we are asked, is not this exactly what they do at an election? What, therefore, is wrong if a people chooses freely at an election to put a government in charge, say, of the whole of its life? This argument is used by many in Britain who are advocates of the Welfare State. You insist on our right, they say, to choose freely and manage our own lives. We choose freely at election time to manage our own lives through the agency of the government which we freely elected. What is wrong with that? The answer, of course, is that a thing is not good merely because it is freely chosen. Choice is a condition of man's serving God; but he does not serve God merely by choosing. To do that, he needs to choose in accordance with God's law. His right is not to make his own way forward in freedom; but to do so under God. If the British people freely chose a government pledged to cut the nose off every sixteen-year old in Britain, it would not be right for such a government to do so, even though freely chosen. In fact, it would be wrong to choose such a government. One reply, therefore, to those who say that Britain's Welfare State is good because freely chosen is that it is not, thereby, made good. A final answer would have to investigate the effect of the system it represents on the human dignity of the British people. Does it assist the right of each to manage his own life responsibly or does it diminish it? If the former, then it is a good thing; if the latter, then it is bad.

In *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pius XI set out the kind of relationship which should exist between government (the State) and the individuals and groups which make up the civic community over which it rules. His words are to be found in paragraphs seventy-nine and eighty of the encyclical.

"It is indeed true, as history clearly proves, that owing to changed circumstances much that was formerly done by small groups can nowadays only be done by large associations. None the less, just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to a group what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so too it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order, for a larger and higher association to arrogate to itself functions which can be per-

formed efficiently by smaller and lower societies. This is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable. Of its very nature the true aim of all social activity should be to help members of the social body, but never to destroy or absorb them.

The State therefore should leave to smaller groups the settlement of business of minor importance, which otherwise would greatly distract it; it will thus carry out with greater freedom, power and success the tasks belonging to it alone, because it alone can effectively accomplish these; directing, watching, stimulating, restraining, as circumstances suggest and necessity demands. Let those in power, therefore, be convinced that the more faithfully this principle of subsidiary function be followed, and a graded hierarchical order exist between various associations, the greater will be both social authority and social efficiency, and the happier and more prosperous the conditions of the Commonwealth.”
(To be concluded)

Fr. Bernard Lungu

Readers are asked to remember in their prayers Fr. Bernard Lungu, a student of Claver House, 1966-67, who was recently killed in a motorcycle accident in Malawi.

A charming man, wise and pastoral, he was much esteemed by both staff and fellow-students, many of whom went to him for counsel. On his return home at the end of the course, he was appointed chaplain to St. John Bosco's Teachers Training College, with the particular injunction from his bishop, to spread the knowledge of social principles and credit unions. But he did not contain himself to the class-room or the college. He established a Farming Club for young school-leavers from the neighbouring parish.

Aged only 37, he must be greatly missed by both the student teachers and young farmers, and by all those who came into regular contact with him.

Right and Wrong

A Tory M.P. Reflects on our Present Discontents

JOHN BIGGS-DAVISON, M.P.

THE United States is the strongest and richest power on earth but seems unable to keep law and order within its coasts. American politics are assuming something of the character of gang warfare. From the Sorbonne to Sussex, from Paris to Prague, from Spain to Sweden, the campus has become a battlefield. Events in Grosvenor Square and some of our places of higher education prove that our own land is not immune from the contagion of anarchy and violence.

Education, they used to say, was the cure for crime and juvenile delinquency. Another progressive theory was that poverty was the cause of crime. Since the war wealth and welfare have increased. So has crime. Still progressives cling to their pathetic faith in the curative effects of education. The epoch of secondary schooling for all and higher education for too many has been one of violence and banditry on a scale of organisation and ruthlessness such as the pre-war generation associated with Chicago, never London. Private security corps were raised to defend premises and payrolls the police could no longer protect. Ah, said the progressives, what we need is a bit more education. Keep them at school another year; let a score of new colleges be built. We know the result. Parents and guardians fear today for the moral and, indeed, physical well-being of their children at university or college of technology.

Causes

Of the student revolt, there are various "progressive" explanations. Some blame the meagerness of grants, the overcrowded lecture halls of what are mere "degree factories", the sordidness of lodgings or bad food. Others, more plaus-

ibly, impugn the lack of consultation and communication, particularly in the many universities without a collegiate system, between the teachers, many of whom are deficient both in character and true scholarship, and the taught, many of whom are uncouth and semi-literate. Others blame the irksome remnants of paternalistic discipline and "Victorian" morality. If that be the explanation, however, why is it that the pampered students of Sweden have also been on the rampage? They endure little hardship and less restraint. Sweden is swept hygienically clean of old-time morality. Swedish students may sleep, or rather stay awake, with whom they please, where they please, how they please. Contraception and abortion are almost part of the curriculum. And there is always suicide.

Others will give a more complacent explanation. "It's all a passing phase." They may be right. Nevertheless, in many countries the class war has been supplanted by the age war. Often the "ruling class" — the older generation — abdicates without a struggle. They flinch before the criticism of their juniors who tell them that they've made a mess of the world and should step aside. Of course they should do no such thing. Age and experience can still confer wisdom. The really big men of our day have flowered in old age. Take the statesmen alone — Churchill, Stalin, Adenauer, De Gaulle, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi-minh. But commerce and its advertisers exploit and fawn upon youth and the consumer society instils in early years the demand for what we do not need and may not even crave.*

Revolt against Modern Society

Even Bishops will defer to "teenagery" and "with it" clerics, faithlessly "conformed to this world", make ludicrous Peter Pans of themselves. And what example is given the young by too many of their elders? The better side of the student revolt which evil men have diabolically

* Cardinal Conway spoke to St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, on June 16th of "a subconscious protest of man's spiritual nature against a crass materialism which is being forced upon him, and against the brainwashing of ordinary people into spending their resources and their leisure on status symbols and empty forms of amusement".

exploited is a hatred of commercialism and hypocrisy. "This explosion", General de Gaulle said, "has been provoked by some groups revolting against modern society, against the consumer society, against the machine society, whether it be Communist in the East or Capitalist in the West". And, we are smugly assured, the two systems are converging in a soulless synthesis. Writing in *La Croix* of May 16th of the French students' rejection of existing society, Father Wenger agreed with M. Pompidou that "the bonds of the family are often dissolved or loosened; the fatherland is discussed or denied. For many, God is dead and the Church itself debates which path to follow and rejects its traditions." The student with his relative intelligence, sensitivity, impatience and capacity for self-pity feels more passionately what is felt by millions vaguely or unconsciously. If he does not believe in God, why should he not accept the rationalism of David Hume, who said that "it is not contrary to reason to prefer the destruction of the whole world to the scratching of my finger"?

Youth is inherently idealistic. But it is often soured into cynicism by those who may condemn the permissive philosophy but practice it themselves. "Do as I say, not do as I do". The gap is not so much between generations as between profession and practice, ethics and conduct. You do not have to be young to lead and to inspire the young. But it is necessary to have a faith and to live it.

Man must worship and, if God be dead, as some theologians would have it, the Devil is very much alive. If there be no Heaven — "out there" or anywhere else; and the Soviet sputnik found no evidence of it — men will imagine that Heaven can be made by them upon earth. In that endeavour they do much evil.

"Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very Heaven."

Wordsworth soon became disillusioned and disgusted by the French Revolution; but we have endured similar sentiments, less poetically expressed, from the left-of-centre columnists and commentators who have praised the Sorbonne revolutionaries.

Social Engineering

Even in our half-century Utopia has succeeded Utopia — the United States, that “last best hope”, the Soviet Union, ‘a New Society’, and the British Welfare State. Despite the Nazi gas chambers and the Communist labour camps — not in Afro-Asia but in enlightened Europe — progressives still are found who ignore the face of original sin and trust in the cleansing efficiency of social engineering. Man, they still try to believe, can be made better by Act of Parliament and by changing his environment, and, according to the humanists now very militant on earth, he can be made still better if released from the taboos of chastity and monogamy to the freedom of abortion and divorce, pornography and perversion. Few of us are not victims of some such illusions. We mostly like to be thought progressive. As King Edward VII said at the Mansion House in 1885, “we are all Socialists nowadays”. The thought of our time is, moreover, impregnated with Marxism.

The Communist “church” is in schism, Eastern Europe is in ferment and, although British Socialists may wallow deeper in the morass of public ownership and centralised state control, the real experts in Socialism from the Elbe to Vladivostock are finding some virtue in market forces. A convergence indeed! Yet, Marxism, whether of Marx himself or the fashionable Marcuse, whether it be totalitarian or anarchistic, whether its inspiration be Russian or Chinese or Cuban, whether it exalts the workers, the students or the guerrilla fighters of the Third World as the chosen class, dominates the minds of many Western intellectuals and influences many more. Nor does the West, reckless of its Greco-Roman, Judaeo-Christian inheritance, present any coherent and convincing counter-philosophy. The ascendancy of Marxism was prepared centuries ago by the rise of materialism. The philosophers of the so-called Enlightenment broke with classical and Christian concepts of man. Hobbes was a cynic about human nature. Rousseau exaggerated man’s natural goodness. Both were materialist to the extent that they rejected the Christian doctrine of man’s creation in the image of God, of grace and original sin. Not man was at

fault, but his faulty institutions and erroneous concepts. Reform was needed rather than redemption.

Hobbes, the French *philosophes* and the Benthamites in England misapplied the methods of the physical sciences to human nature and human society. Ignoring the distinction between man and the lower creation, they paved a way for the materialist doctrines and totalitarian horrors of the twentieth century. They opposed reason to reverence, intelligence to custom, science to tradition, whereas all are necessary.

The certainties of Marxism attract intelligent people who possess no higher faith. They offer a dynamic interpretation of the universe not in terms of being but in terms of motion. So Marxism is "trendy". It takes advantage of the very general tendency to equate "new" with "good" and to judge a person or idea or institution according to whether it is considered "out of date", "out of keeping with modern thought" or "contrary to the spirit of the age". (We're not living in the Middle Ages or the reign of Queen Victoria, you know.") If these are our criteria rather than those of truth and falsehood, beauty and ugliness, good and evil, we might as well become Marxists ourselves.

Purposeless Progressivism

For the dialectical materialist, truth is strictly relative to social conditions and class interest. That is true and good which serves the cause of revolutionary change. But many who would strenuously deny Communist affiliations, many who are in no way fellow-travellers hold that morals must minister to the convenience of a consensus or the ideology of those in power. Government, they say, must deal with society as it is and take account of public opinion. But is it the duty of the State to mirror society at its most decadent and depraved? We need not then be surprised that our intellectual and cultural establishment are pink in politics and permissive in morals (keener on State control than self-control!). They substitute a sloppy internationalism for kinship and nationhood. "Kith and kin" is a sneer-word. They are racialists in reverse. They judge massacre and

genocide by a double standard of selective indignation. They condone the crimes and cruelties of any dictatorship or military junta, provided it be of the Left, or at least anti-British.

The American poet, Robert Frost, described them thus :

“ I am a Liberal

I mean, so altruistically moral,

I never take my own side in a quarrel.”

Their soggy, purposeless progressivism invades the media of information. The body politic suppurates with cults of dirt, drugs and despair. The balance is lost between experiment and scepticism on the one hand and authority and tradition on the other. Progress is what matters — not the direction. It was thus with the Gadarene swine. And it was of such an establishment that Charles Péguy, a Christian poet and patriot, wrote:

“ They are wounded by greatness; it really make them ill. They enjoy denigrating heroes and saints.”

But change is in the air. Kingsley Amis rounds upon the Left. John Braine has joined the Monday Club. Malcolm Muggeridge denounces the “ Liberal Death Wish ”, before a Monday Club audience. Clear-thinking men are moving to the Right. For (if you will pardon the pun !) there are no soft options left for Britain. Enoch Powell has declared it open season for sacred cows.

No blind necessity presides over the evolution of human society. History is not a conveyor belt. History is made by God and man. It is not irreversible. “ A man’s heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps.” Winds veer — even winds of change. Premature decolonisation, the liberation of primitive peoples who trusted their erstwhile protectors, to chaos, misery and massacre was no inevitable process. It has been justified as the virtue of necessity. But it was certainly not virtuous, nor was it necessary.

Brave Portugal

Brave Portugal, with whom we share an ancient alliance and the patronage of St. George, has proved that in Angola,

Mozambique and in Guinea. She declined U.S. aid. Portugal is not the richest or the strongest or the most populous of the European states having African responsibilities. But she holds firm. She, at least, has not lost all sense of mission and, colour-blind, may yet build in Africa as she did in Brazil, an inter-racial society. Meanwhile, she guards for Europe and the West those Atlantic and Indian Ocean coasts and ports which are main objectives in the tricontinental strategy of Communist powers. And what is the gratitude of Harold Wilson? The Beira blockade!

Fortunately, most of our people are shrewdly resistant to the destructive doctrines of their rulers and intellectual betters. But the fish is rotting from the head and the moral anarchy of the goggle-box and the new *trahison des clercs* are given political impetus by Socialist misgovernment.

We Betray our Friends and Help our Enemies

Our people are ingenious and inventive, sluggish yet invincible. Our fighting men have shown that they can win battles and beat Communism. They won in Malaya, outfaced Soekarno, rescued ungrateful Arab and African rulers from revolution. Nor was it our sailors and marines, soldiers and airmen who gave in to Nasser. But debtor dependence, our rulers' subservience to the United States and the United Nations and futile appeasement of the unappeasable of Afro-Asia have undermined much of the confidence of the British in themselves and of the world in the British. We betray our friends oversea and subsidize our enemies. We seize the passports of those fighting for our common civilisation and grant them to terrorists who would destroy it. No wonder that abroad when we are not treated with contempt we are regarded with pity.

The dockers who marched on Westminster and came to see me at the House of Commons wanted not merely a halt to immigration but to hear again the authentic language of national leadership. The name of Churchill was on their lips.

The Conservative Party is not proof against degeneracy and materialism. Too often it has compromised with

sectional interests and the Whiggish or Liberal or Socialist spirit of the age. Successive centuries have seen struggle between the truly Tory and the narrowly Conservative. There have been those who in office were content to run before every wind of change that blew and accept and administer with minor modifications the existing order. So every Labour Government carried us further towards the Total State, further towards 1984, whereas succeeding Conservative Administrations put the clock of doom back not one minute. Mr. Ronald Butt wrote in the Bow Group journal, *Crossbow*, that in the last phase of Mr. Macmillan's Administration, the appeal was to "the opinion formers (who traverse the formal barriers of politics like an octopus with tentacles in many different camps) Government departments, the organisations of business and trade unions, the Press and the universities". So there was no policy.

Too few have been the Conservative leaders with the resolution and wisdom to make requisite reforms, counter revolution with social justice, and present in modern idiom those principles of enduring, even eternal validity it is the duty of a Conservative Party to conserve but which have often been obscured by opportunism or timidity.

Socialists are blinkered by their fallacious and obsolete obsessions. The worse the mess they make, the more they exhort the children to cling tighter to Nanny. If their measures miscarry, it is the wayward children's fault, not theirs. But "consensus Conservatives", forgetful of the Churchillian maxim, "Trust the People", think in much the same way. Of course, a Government must seek wide support for its measures but a consensus made up of a bit of what is right and a bit of what is wrong is death to democracy. The marching dockers, the upsurge of Celtic nationalist revolt against central bureaucracy are signs of the times. There is an urge to recover individual and national identity and purpose. Patriotism, the starting point for European, Commonwealth and wider co-operation and of a sound world order, has ceased to be unmentionable.

The winds of change are veering. The tide is on the turn.

INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

In this article Dr. Jackson describes the part money plays as a unit of account, the purpose of paper money, the control of Bank credit, and how these controls work, the discounting of bills, and the purpose of Special Deposits.

What Kind of Economic System ?

(VIII) Money and Banking

J. M. JACKSON

THE banking system of any advanced industrial country plays an important role in the control of the economy. Before considering the way we might like to see the banking system function, it is perhaps necessary to take a quick look at how it is supposed to work at the present time. It must be admitted that this is not easy. The functioning of the monetary system is complex, and even experts in this branch of economics are not by any means agreed about the way certain aspects of the system really work.

What is Money ?

First of all we need to know what is money, and what its purpose is. The most obvious function of money is that it acts as a *medium of exchange*. In primitive economies, households may be largely self-supporting. In a medieval village, for example, most households had an area of land on which it grew most of the food it needed and so on. Not every man, however, had a mill to grind the corn he had grown into flour. One miller might be able to grind all the corn of the village. In return, he might be paid by being given a proportion of the flour he had ground for the villagers.

So long as exchanges of this kind were very few and

always of a familiar kind, no great difficulty arose. As economic life becomes more complex, however, barter arrangements are extremely inconvenient or even quite impracticable. One man may spend a long time making some article. A boat builder, for example, may spend weeks making a boat. He needs to find somebody who wants to buy a boat. But even when he finds somebody, will that person want to offer in exchange the kind of article he wants. The potential buyer may be a fisherman whose old boat is near the end of its useful life. He might be prepared to offer the whole of his catch — even several days' catch — for a new boat but this is hardly likely to be acceptable to the boat builder. He may like a meal of fish occasionally, but not several boatloads !

In a money economy, on the other hand, it is easy enough for the fisherman to save up a sum sufficient to pay for the boat, and the boatbuilder can then use this money to buy all the different things that he needs. Money also serves a second useful function in that it acts as a *unit of account*. Things would be pretty chaotic if prices were quoted in the form one boat equals 1 ton of fish or 20 bushels of corn or 5 cwt. of turnips and so on. It is very much more convenient if everything is expressed in terms of some common denominator, which we call money.

In the history of mankind, a great many different substances have acted as money. People have used cattle as money, shells, precious metals (often in the form of coins, which simply represent a known weight and fineness of metal) paper, and even entries in the books of a bank. The essential quality of money is that it is acceptable.*

Must money be Valuable?

There is a persistent idea that money should be some-

* It is important to realise that the two functions are separate. In certain circumstances, the unit of account might cease to be acceptable as a means of exchange. Thus in periods of very rapid inflation, the price of goods may continue to be expressed in terms of the normal currency, but people may become reluctant to accept the currency in payment because its value is falling rapidly. Instead, they may ask for payment in terms of some foreign currency, or in kind, or they may if paid in their own currency immediately buy goods with it rather than hold it in the normal way.

thing that is valuable in itself. There is the long history of using precious metals as money, and even today gold retains an important role in international settlements. Gold certainly had much to recommend it as a form of money at one time. Like other metals, it can readily be divided in order to make relatively small payments. It is valuable for its bulk, so that large payments could still be made conveniently. Silver and copper could, of course, be used to supplement gold, especially for the purpose of making the smallest payments, for which the quantity of gold needed would be inconveniently small.

Gradually, however, the actual use of gold came to play a smaller part in the settlement of trade debts. People tended to deposit their gold with the goldsmiths and to accept a receipt for them. If they needed to make a payment, they could theoretically take the receipt to the goldsmith, recover the gold and hand it over to their creditor. In practice, however, they could simply give the receipt to the creditor. Thus the gold on deposit passed into the ownership of the creditor, and he had been paid without the gold actually changing hands. This was the origin of banking.

Two important developments need to be noted. First, the emergence of the bank note in its present form. Originally a goldsmith would have made out a receipt for the actual amount of gold deposited. Gradually, however, the practice grew up whereby bankers issued notes for £5 or £10 or similar denominations. Each note represented a definite amount of gold deposited with the bank and a promise to repay that amount in gold on demand.

The bankers very soon realised that gold was being left in their vaults, whilst their banknotes (promises to pay gold on demand) were circulating as a medium of exchange. There were always a few people who needed to make payments in gold and who presented the notes for exchange, but these were comparatively few. The bankers saw in this situation the opportunity to make a profit.

Suppose a businessman wanted to undertake some new venture. He needed money to finance this venture and looked for somebody to lend it to him. The bankers now realised

that they could print a few extra bank notes. If a businessman approached a banker for a loan of £1,000, the banker would hand over notes to this value and the businessman could use them to pay his workers, firms supplying him with materials and so on. These notes would still carry the bankers promise to give gold in exchange on demand, but they were no longer a receipt for gold actually deposited. The printing of these notes added to the volume of notes in circulation. By using the printing press, the bankers could increase the total amount of money in circulation. Although some people might maintain that only gold was *really* money, nevertheless most people accepted these notes in lieu of gold and the effect was the same as if more gold were circulating. For lending this newly printed money, the banks charged interest, as would any lender.

The Quantity of Money

What happens when more money is put into circulation in this way? At one time, economists would have argued that since there is more money and the same quantity of goods, the inevitable result is that prices rise. This is an oversimplified story. The level of prices will depend upon three things, the volume of transactions taking place, the amount of money in circulation and its velocity of circulation. If we assume that there is a given volume of transactions, doubling the amount of money in circulation need not double prices for each piece of money in existence might be used less frequently. Nevertheless, there is a grain of truth in the suggestion that the creation of more money will tend to raise prices. Thus in Tudor times, the influx of gold from the New World led to a marked rise in prices in Europe.

To some extent the impact of printing more money will depend upon the economic conditions at the time. If there is already full employment, and businessmen borrow newly created money to finance a new venture, we have more money chasing a limited supply of goods. Prices are forced up. The man who borrows the new money can get hold of some of the community's scarce resources because prices have risen so that the money held by other people will no longer buy

all of what is being currently produced. If, on the other hand, there is unemployment, the creation of money in this way will enable businessmen to give work to men who would otherwise have been unemployed.

Thus the ability to increase or decrease the supply of money in the country is an important power, for it involves the stability of the general level of prices and the level of economic activity.

Deposit Banking

The issue of banknotes in Britain is now virtually a monopoly of the Bank of England. The whole of the note issue of the bank is now *fiduciary*. This means that there is no gold backing at all for the notes. The promise to pay £1 on demand printed on the note is now quite meaningless, for there is nothing in which payment can be made except another pound note. The ultimate form of money in Britain today is the paper banknotes printed by the Bank of England. They are valuable only because people are willing to accept them in settlement of debts: they no longer have value because they can be exchanged for gold which has its own intrinsic value.

Now that the Bank of England has a monopoly of the note issue, the ordinary commercial banks have concentrated on deposit banking. People deposit cash with them, and can use cheques either to withdraw the cash deposited when they need it, or to make payment by transferring the right to make this withdrawal to their creditor. There are advantages in this system. If a person deposits his cash at the bank, he does not run the risk of having it stolen. He can make most of his payments by cheque. It is convenient to be able to make out a cheque for the exact amount instead of bothering with change, and, of course, very convenient to make a really large payment by cheque instead of handling a suitcase full of notes.

If deposits always originated in the actual deposit of cash (i.e. notes or coin), the quantity of money would be determined by the Bank of England, subject to government control. In practice, however, the same kind of thing has happened as with bank notes. Originally the notes were convertible

into gold, but even whilst this was the legal position, the notes circulated freely and were accepted as money. And so the note issue went beyond the value of gold deposited. Now that the bank notes are the ultimate cash base and deposits are in a sense substitutes for them, and convertible into cash, deposits have come to play by far the more important part in the settlement of transactions. Moreover, deposits have ceased to be just a substitute for cash in so far as banks have learned that they can create deposits without actually receiving cash into their vaults first.

Because cash once deposited tended to stay in the banks, and to be transferred from one account to another in settlement of indebtedness without being withdrawn, the banks found they could give a businessman seeking a loan an *overdraft*. This is simply the right to make out a cheque or cheques beyond the amount of cash he has deposited, if any. His creditor receives the cheque and pays it into his (the creditor's) account. Once this happens, the deposit is quite indistinguishable from a deposit that arises from paying cash over the counter of the bank or paying in a cheque on an account which originally represented a paying in of cash. Today, banks allow their deposits to increase by making loans in this way until they are about twelve times the total amount of cash in the banks' vaults. The greater part of the country's effective money supply consists of these deposits. Coin, and even notes to a large extent, are merely the small change of the modern economy.

The Control of Bank Credit

The banks cannot lend without limit in the way just described. In order to understand the way in which the Bank of England, now a nationalised institution, can control the activities of the commercial banks, we need to look a little more closely at the balance sheets of the latter. Their liabilities consist almost entirely of deposits. In other words, they have the obligation to repay in cash the sums deposited with them, whether these originated from customers paying in cash or paying in cheques from people who had been permitted to have overdrafts. Some people will always need

to withdraw money from their accounts. Businessmen, for example, need to withdraw cash in order to pay most of their workers. The banks need, therefore, to keep a certain amount of cash in their tills. This, together with deposits they keep at the Bank of England, amount to about 8 per cent of the deposit liabilities.¹ In addition, the banks hold what are known as liquid assets, which can very quickly be turned into cash. This includes money loaned to the London discount houses. The discount houses use the money to buy Treasury Bills, short term government securities.² These loans can be called in at very short notice, often overnight. These assets amount to about 20 per cent of the banks' deposit liabilities. Finally, the banks hold assets which can only be turned into cash with difficulty, long-term government securities and advances to customers (overdrafts).

The banks must keep a minimum of about 8 per cent cash to deposits, and also a reasonable ratio of other liquid assets to deposit liabilities. If, therefore, the Bank of England could reduce the amount of cash held by the ordinary banks, it would force them to reduce their lending to businessmen. The amount of money in use would be reduced, and according to the older theories, this would tend to bring down prices. This effect is unlikely to be very pronounced in practice. But if banks are forced to restrict their lending to businessmen, businessmen in turn may be forced to refrain from new ventures they had intended to finance with money borrowed from the banks. So in a period of inflation and an overheated economy, things would be damped down.

How the Controls work

The Bank of England can resort to *open market operations*. It will itself hold Treasury Bills and other government securities. It sells them. The public who buy them make out cheques in favour of the Bank of England. To effect

1. The Bank of England acts as the bankers' bank. A deposit with the Bank of England is virtually as good as cash, since it is under an obligation to repay the deposit on demand.

2. The government relies heavily on this short term borrowing to finance expenditure, especially at those times in the year when revenue is small. At those times when revenue reaches its peak, the government will be reducing the amount of Treasury Bills issued, that is reducing its short-term indebtedness.

this payment, the commercial banks have to transfer part of their deposits with the Bank of England to the ownership of the Bank of England. This deposit with the Bank of England forms part of the cash reserve of the commercial banks, and therefore the effect is to reduce their cash reserves. As we have seen, this means they must begin to call in their loans.

They will begin by calling in their loans to the discount houses. To do this, the houses will have to take some of the Treasury Bills they hold to the Bank of England. The Bank may, however, re-discount the bills at *Bank Rate*. Discounting a bill simply means buying it for less than the sum to be repaid at the end of the specified period, three months in the case of a Treasury Bill. The rate of discount is, in other words, the rate of interest at which the person taking the bill lends. Bank Rate, however, is normally well above the ordinary market rate of interest. When the discount houses find they are forced to repay their loans to the banks and have to get money in this way from the Bank of England, they lose money. To avoid this in future, they raise the rate of discount (interest) on any Treasury Bills they take up in future. This leads to a general increase in interest rates which in turn helps to damp down the level of economic activity.

Finally, the Bank of England can call for *Special Deposits* from the commercial banks. We have seen that they normally do have deposits with the Bank of England. If, however, Special Deposits are called for, these must be kept at the Bank of England — in other words, can not be withdrawn at will. So by calling for Special Deposits amounting to say 1 per cent of deposits, the Bank of England has denied the commercial banks the right to withdraw this amount of its deposit with itself and thus reduced the effective cash reserve of the banks at a stroke of the pen.

So the scene is set for the next article in which we can move on from this very simplified account of how the system works to the question of how it ought to work.

To what extent is religion a cause of the backwardness in Spain, Italy and Latin America? Is it an invasion of human freedom to recondition criminals against their will? Christ gave all priests the power to forgive sins. Why then are some sins reserved?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

To what extent is religion a cause of the backwardness of e.g. Spain, Italy and Latin America?

"Backwardness" by what standards? The "forwardness" of some countries is based on a dominantly materialistic assessment of values, which is false and corrupting. When human progress is measured mainly by technological achievements and a material standard of living the outlook for civilization is frightening.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

The space race of Russia and the U.S.A., and the arms race of all the "forward" nations, are deplorable; and the backward nations are fortunate to be non-starters.

Their existence below the level of decent living has many causes, and religion is not one of them. Religion demands, as part of the service of God, the recognition of human rights, a full use of talents, and the right exploitation of the material universe. One obvious reason for the poverty of Spain and Italy is a lack of those natural resources required for industrialization. Spain has suffered from building her economies on supplies of precious metals — the spoils of her conquest of Spanish America — instead of on development of the homeland. For the rest, it is lack of religion, or failure to apply its principles, which has kept so many millions destitute in the countries you mention — the greed of the conquerors and the civil authorities, a grossly unjust distribution of wealth, and, very often, anti-religious per-

secuting governments. The one outstanding example of social justice — the Jesuit missions in Paraguay — was destroyed by covetous colonialists.

Social justice should be fought for and achieved in the main by the laity; but they need to be led, stimulated and supported by courageous clergy. It is sad that so many clergy acquiesced blindly in an unjust system.

Is it an invasion of human freedom to recondition criminals against their will?

When a criminal is within range of the reconditioning you mention, he is in custody, and a decision has already been taken to limit his freedom. If you do not object to incarceration for crime, you would agree, I presume, that a criminal, by his offences against law and order, loses for some time his right to freedom of movement or free choice of residence.

In prison he is necessarily subjected to some external discipline, which could be a kind of reconditioning. He is forced to rise and retire at a fixed time, to take a fixed amount of fresh air and exercise, and to work during fixed times. All that is merely part of the original deprivation of liberty, and it is justified. At what point can justification no longer be claimed? At the point where techniques begin to be used which wrest an inner assent from mind and will. Any penal institution must require external conformity or the place would be in disorder; but the prisoner can be left free to accept or reject discipline interiorly. In the systems of thought-control used, for example, in China, the person is systematically forced, by being subjected to physical and psychological pressures, into ways of thinking and deciding which are communal rather than personal. Personality, which is individual, is deliberately drained and desiccated. The process is comparable to the old Chinese mutilation of the feet of girls by encasing them in tight bandages; but it is far more cruel.

Pray do not call that practice "indoctrination" and then equiparate it with the teaching of catholicism! The practice

s torture and tyranny; but the aim, at least, of religious teaching is to secure a personal dedication. If religion is not personal it is not religion.

**Christ gave all priests the power to forgive sins.
Why then are some sins "reserved" ?**

The power of absolving from sin in Christ's name is given in the sacrament of Holy Orders. The exercise of that power is under the control of the hierarchy, successors of the apostles to whom Christ gave jurisdiction over his whole church, and especially of the Pope, who has primacy of jurisdiction. The difference between the power of orders and the exercise of that power by the conferring of jurisdiction can be illustrated from ordinary practice in society: a judge has judicial powers, but he exercises them only in the court to which he is appointed by the person or body possessed of full judicial authority and able to delegate it.

In order to hear confessions validly a priest has to be given "faculties", usually by the bishop of the diocese in which he is to act as confessor, in certain circumstances, as in emergencies, directly by the Church through canon law. The giver of jurisdiction can put whatever limits he likes to his grant — it can be for as long as a priest holds a particular office, or for a set time, or for one particular occasion as the giving of a retreat or a mission; or it can exclude authority for the absolving of certain sins.

At different times and in different places, bishops have become aware that a particular sin of special evil effects, perjury for example, is being committed often within their diocese. To bring home to their flock the great wickedness of such a sin, they reserve absolution from it to themselves or to certain confessors, and require that offenders be seriously warned and receive exemplary penance.

If there are "flying saucers" manned by intelligent beings, shall we eventually have to convert them to Christianity ?

By "intelligent" I suppose you mean having an intellect.

Intellectual beings are, by definition, persons and naturally immortal. If there are such flying-saucer persons, creatures of God, they will have a natural knowledge of God and owe Him love and obedience. When we have learned to communicate, Christianity will be one of our realities, the greatest in our history, which will be a subject of communication; but we shall not have to convert them to it.

There is a novel by C. S. Lewis called *Perelandra*. It describes inhabitants of the planet Venus in a Garden-of-Eden state, perfect in their nature with not a trace of moral evil. Suppose these flying-saucer persons were of that kind. They would be fulfilling themselves according to God's will, and would have no need of redemption. Our wickedness as a race would appal them. They would be horrified at our kind of death. Perhaps their knowledge of God would be natural only, without revelation. Knowledge of Christ would perhaps be their first introduction to the Blessed Trinity and they could adore the Person of the Word and admire his Incarnation; but the Incarnation would be alien to them — the Second Person of the Trinity was made *Man*, and whatever they are they are not men.

Good or bad, benevolent or malevolent? If they are sending out explorers to size us up, they must be considerably in advance of us in technology. Their superior intelligence, given that it is in the service of God, could be offered to help us in our countless difficulties, and we might find them converting us to Christianity.

Book Reviews

THE REASON WHY

The Church in Our Day, Joint Pastoral of the American Hierarchy; Catholic Truth Society, 2s 6d.
Is It the Same Church by F. J. Sheed; Sheed & Ward, 32s 6d; pp. 236. **Faith Comes by Hearing** by F. J. Sheed; Sheed & Ward, 12s 6d; pp. 192.
Why be a Christian? by Rosemary Haughton; Geoffrey Chapman, 10s 6d; pp. 141.

THERE is a sentence in the magisterial joint pastoral of the American Hierarchy that brought me up with a start. Speaking of those Catholics who "measure the Church exclusively in terms of social effectiveness, of cultural conformity, or of whatever efficiency most appeals to their special interest", they go on to remind the reader that, "These things, many good in themselves, are hardly adequate norms for evaluating the open, eternal, transcendent, human yet divine Church of God. If one seeks confirmation of this, let him ponder how Jesus Christ would fare if He were measured only in terms of the historical effort of His preaching or by the secular relevancy or suitability of His Person to His times".

In other words, a good many progressive Catholics, at present vociferous in their criticism of their Church's "failure", so quick to point out her "unawareness" of present need and her "non-commitment" to temporary, transient causes, would probably have dismissed Christ Our Lord and his teaching as irrelevant. Had they been alive when he lived in Palestine, they would have scored him as ineffective because out of touch with contemporary need. He "wasted" the first thirty years of his life in a remote village, then spent three wandering about in unorganised fashion with a few poor fishermen as his immediate followers; he was totally unmethodical in all he did, advocated no kind of social

reform, did nothing to protest against the alien and tyrannical rule which Rome had set over his countrymen. This was hardly commitment as we have been taught recently by outré clerics to understand it. There is here no public confrontation with evil of the sort we are told by progressive laymen the Church should undertake today against the régime in South Africa or the Franco Government in Spain (though, strangely, not against the régime in Russia or the Mao Government in China). These would have dismissed Christ as irrelevant had they been active when he was walking around Galilee. They would not recognise him. I think, were he to come into our world today. I find the thought startling in the extreme. I also find it comforting. It shakes me somewhat. I think it is true.

Catholic progressives who think in this fashion — who judge the truth of their Church by the extent of its commitment — are given the rough treatment they deserve by Frank Sheed in his splendid, *Is It the Same Church?* :

“All through our years of teaching the Faith under the open sky we had been meeting a particular line of refusal to be concerned with any enquiry as to Who Christ was or What He was. Such questions were dismissed as mere theology, what mattered was the objector's personal salvation : which reduced the whole great fact of Christ to ‘What's in it for me?’.

“The ‘I'm saved’ man was a special type. Now something of the same attitude, altruised into ‘What's in it for men’, is all over the Christian world under the name of reverence. That has suddenly become the Golden Word. Where once a statement about God and man had only to be true to be accepted, now it must be relevant. And ‘relevant’ with its co-word ‘meaningful’, is applied very narrowly—most of theology is excluded. Yet every truth we learn about God is a new reason for loving God — and what could be more relevant, more meaningful, than that? To love God is Christ's first commandment. But one hears precious little talk these days of loving God.”

This is well said indeed. The error of those Catholics

whose tendency today is to judge their Church solely in terms of its relevance, can be called, for want of a better word, subjectivism; by which one means that a thing is true to the extent that it suits, meets my own needs or those of the times in which we live. The implication, of course, is that truth is relative; something that can be changed to suit human need. There is more than a hint of this in some contemporary Catholic writing. Pushed to its logical extreme, subjectivism means the end of the Church as the guardian of God's truth and the end of Christ as the Founder of the Church. If truth is that which suits man's convenience, then man not God is its arbiter; there are as many "truths" as there are men and there can be no lasting unity of any sort anywhere because the foundation of unity is adherence to objective truth. ...

It is primarily from the standpoint of objective truth, not relevance, that one must examine the Church. One has to start, in other words, with the reason why, with what Christ meant his Church to be: the first question to ask about the Church is why Christ founded it. Frank Sheed answers with effective simplicity that Christ founded his Church to continue his work amongst men:

"We can too easily think of it as existing simply for the spiritual well-being of its members, as an arrangement for ensuring that they shall be able to receive the uttermost nourishment — nourishment of truth and life, in union with Christ. All this is truly so in the Church, but it is *not* why Christ founded it. Its function is to do work in the world that Christ wanted done — to bring His truth and sacramental life to all nations, to every creature until the end of time.

"He entrusted this work to men, and not as a token or any kind of fiction. Men were not simply to be spectators at the world's redemption. What human wills and intelligences can do, He wants them to do, with His grace to aid. Any one of us can advance the work, or neglect it, or mar it badly.

"Think of the Church as Christ's Mystical Body. The purpose of a body — any body — is not the health of

its cells, but the service of the one whose body it is : the cells and their health are a means to that end. If Christ had not needed a body for the work He still had to accomplish in the world, there would have been no point in founding the kind of Church He did."

Sheed returns to the same theme in *Faith Comes by Hearing*, which he has written as the successor to his *Catholic Evidence Training Outlines*:

"The Church, we should constantly remind our hearers, does not exist primarily for the spiritual well-being of its members. It exists because Christ has a work to do in it — the work of bringing men to his Father, of bringing his gifts of truth and life and union to the world till the end of time. . . .

"The Church is in the world. But the world is in the Church too. Priests can forgive sin, can consecrate, can offer Mass : pope and episcopate have authority to teach Christ's truth in his name, and to state the moral law. Where they are acting within the limits of the commission Christ has given them, the teaching will be true, the sacraments will be life-giving, the Mass will be profitable to salvation. But in the daily running of the Church there can be misjudgment, failure of vision and sheer sin. Our spiritual leaders are still men who 'must work out their salvation in fear and trembling' ; their office in the Church does not make them immune from temptation; they can sin, there is no guarantee of Salvation for any of them.

"In the Church Christ founded we find life and truth and these are gifts beyond price. Yet it is evident that the truth and life would have been spread more widely through the world but for the sins and errors of the men to whom Christ entrusted them. All this applies to the laity as well — more people actually make contact with us than with our leaders : they could gain immensely from our utterance of the great truths if we could and would utter them, and from our living them if we lived them better."

Were the truth of the Church dependent on the perfection

of its instruments it would have perished long since; been repudiated by men, as Charles Davis so foolishly repudiated it. What we have to notice and take to ourselves, especially in these confusing days, is that the Church takes the truth from its origins, its foundation by Christ who brought it into being to continue his work amongst men. What matters is that it be true to its origins; guarding the deposit of Faith, continuing to discover its riches and depict Christ, as Frank Sheed observes, not as a person, but extending them to all mankind.

The thing that has to be asked first about the Church, therefore, is not whether it is relevant, but whether it is true; not whether it helps, as in fact it does, but whether Christ founded it; not whether its members are alive to the problems of the world, but whether they are alive with the life of Christ through which alone they can bring true light to the darkness which is the world. One has to start the right way round — with the truth of the Church as God made it, and then with its relevance. To reverse the order is to place truth in jeopardy, to set God in the image of man.

One is a Christian, therefore, not primarily because it helps, but because Christianity is true; not primarily because it makes me feel good or brings a new dimension to living, but because Christ died for me. The task of the Christian is to know Christ and love him. Rosemary Haughton talks a lot about love in her latest book, but awfully little about Christ. In any exposition of the Christian message I do not see that you can separate the two. It is all the more interesting, therefore, to find the separation existing in the pages of *Why be a Christian?* Presumably, because, according to Mrs. Haughton, you should be a Christian because it helps you to love and so to live; but this, as we have seen, is not the primary criterion for accepting Christianity. It seems to me dangerous to imply that it is, especially in terms that depict Christ, as Frank Sheed observes, not as a person, but as love-of-neighbour personified. In *Is It the Same Church?* he writes pertinently on this point :

“To many devout Christians Christ is little more

than a hallowed name for the aspirations of the human heart.

"This seeing of Christ not as a person but as love-of-neighbour personified surely accounts for many who spoke of Gandhi as Christ-like, knowing as little of Gandhi as of Christ. In practice it means seeing both of them as one's own best self. And oneself at one's best — even Gandhi at his best — is a pathetically and frighteningly impoverished substitute for the Christ of Nazareth, Capharnaum and Bethany and Jerusalem — the Christ who was in the beginning with God, and who was God.

"All through our years of teaching the Faith under the open sky we had been meeting a particular line of refusal to be concerned with any enquiry as to Who Christ was or What He was. Such questions were dismissed as mere theology, what mattered was the objector's personal salvation: which reduced the whole great fact of Christ to 'What's in it for me?'"

I commend this passage to Mrs. Haughton. It presents the case that ought to be made with regard to her book in terms far more pertinent and, indeed, charitable than I would be capable of myself.

Paul Crane, S.J.